



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

lett's fiction—almost uncannily vivid at times; never quite real. The author, in fact, realizes his imaginings far better than he imagines reality. He is not a great psychologist. We would like to be made to understand a little more clearly how a poet of Byron's intellectual greatness could seem so small a man as through the mist of praise and scandal we see him. Particularly in this age, when the "Childe Harold" tradition seems dead as the sentiment that shed maudlin tears over the verses of Tom Moore, we need insight, not satire. But we are disappointed: Bendish is not a *great* egoist; beside him, the egoist of George Meredith is a titan. We are told that Bendish's mind characteristically worked by vividly conceiving in advance the desired end and then choosing his means accordingly. But this is true of all who are not madmen or doctrinaires. The peculiarity of Bendish was that he always pictured a personal triumph; in other words, vainglory was his dominant note. In the end we cannot help asking, Why all this pother about a man so petty and so uncomplex?

So far as it is taken biographically, Mr. Hewlett's novel seems unloyal to letters. As fiction it is not without charm: the persuasive style, the delicate tracery and decoration of thought, are here. There are keen strokes of satire, and the portrait of Bendish, whatever we may think of its significance, is sharply etched. Gervase Poore, as mad poet and manly man, has life. But even as fiction, *Bendish* is less rewarding than Mr. Hewlett's purely imaginative tales.

---

GREEK IMPERIALISM. By WILLIAM SCOTT FERGUSON, PROFESSOR OF ANCIENT HISTORY, HARVARD UNIVERSITY. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1913.

This is a book not only for scholars, but for all who like mental food "with some chaw to it." The close correlation of arguments and facts, the unmistakable clearness and refreshing variety of the style, the modern breadth of view embracing political insight as well as historic understanding, not to speak of an occasional dry appreciation of human nature, will be relished by all who enjoy a fine, vigorous play of intellect, irrespective of subject-matter. Professor Ferguson has a faculty for generalization that makes his *obiter dicta* and the incidental expansions of his theme of prime importance. No man has a keener instinct than he for true analogies between things ancient and modern or between phenomena geographically remote.

In four chapters we traverse rapidly, and with a clearly differentiated point of view, the entire classical period of Greek history. Then we sail, as in a galleon, into the troubled waters of the period following the death of Alexander, and, in spite of apprehensions, we are not storm-tossed. In the development of Greek imperialism, Professor Ferguson has found a safe and direct course from the beginning to the end of Greek political experience—a trade-wind, blowing steadily in one general direction. Thus the confused period of the Diadochi, the imperial policies of the Ptolemies, the Seleucids, the Antigonids, and the struggles of the Grecian leagues win a new intelligibility and significance. "In government as in science," writes Professor Ferguson, "the classic period was but the youthful bloom of Greece, whereas its vigorous ma-

turity—in which it was cut down by Rome—came in the Macedonian time.” The imperial tendency had from the beginning to contend vainly with the obstinate separatism of the Greek city states. Neither Athens nor Sparta, nor—least of all—Thebes, was able to convert its hegemonies into permanent empires; and when some sort of unification had become essential, with characteristic conservatism the Greek people struggled against the inevitable. According to Professor Ferguson’s view there were two rival solutions of the central political problem. These were the federal systems of which the city-state was originally the unit, and the deification of rulers.

Both Plato and Aristotle almost inevitably failed to see the necessary trend of civilization: Plato because he was obsessed by the attempt “to mend city constitutions when the world required the creation of larger territorial states”; Aristotle because, although he noted in one passage of the *Politics* that “if the Greeks were united in a single polity they would be capable of universal empire,” he considered such a consummation the reverse of desirable, expressly excepting the city-state from the rule that the stronger must rule the weaker. With Alexander, the work of empire-building began in earnest, and it is he who first makes use of the device of deification. Just as he required the form of salutation called *proskynesis* from his followers present in person, so he required from distant cities the acknowledgment of his godhead. Such acknowledgment, then, was “the *proskynesis* of cities.”

Whether or not too much stress is laid by the author upon this device of deification as a means of evading and at the same time sanctioning imperial government, is the controversial point, if there is one, in the book. Certainly the expedient would seem to have been adopted in the first place by Alexander chiefly for the sake of its effect upon his Asiatics, and it is perhaps a question whether in Hellas proper it did him more harm or good. If the rough Macedonian soldiers could joke about “the son of Jupiter,” it is hard to think of the cultivated Athenian of the period as being much impressed, and at a later date Demetrius Poliorcetes indulged in some not very seemly jesting about his “sister Athene.” But perhaps the want of reverence in particular cases is exactly what proves the value of the thing in its more general significance; for the deification of rulers would not be the first or last device which men have resolved to take seriously in a public sense, while privately mocking at it.

Professor Ferguson requires us to use some historic imagination—to view the development of thought on political subjects more or less apart from the views held at a particular time by any one thinker. The philosophy of history is not an easy subject in which to reach assured convictions, yet Professor Ferguson’s conclusions are not merely suggestive, but satisfactorily convincing. He pilots us safely and with an exhilarating sense of progress, through a period full of dangers to the inexperienced navigator.

---

THE MESSAGE OF GREEK ART. By H. H. POWERS, Ph.D., PRESIDENT OF THE BUREAU OF UNIVERSITY TRAVEL. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1913.

Without professing to write what may be regarded in any sense as a